

From: "Earl Staelin" <estaelin@comcast.net>  
To: <wtc@nist.gov>  
Subject: Comments on Draft Report on Collapse of WTC 7

COMMENTS ON NIST DRAFT REPORT ON WTC 7  
September 11, 2008

VIA EMAIL: [wtc@nist.gov](mailto:wtc@nist.gov)

WTC Technical Information Repository  
Attn: Mr. Stephen Cauffman  
National Institute of Standards and Technology  
Stop 8610  
Gaithersburg, MD 20899-8610

Dear Mr. Cauffman:

As a trial lawyer I have handled numerous cases involving scientific issues, the laws of physics and chemistry, construction, and structural failure. In the very limited time you have allowed for comments on the NIST draft report on building 7, I offer the following:

In NIST's draft report on the collapse of WTC building 7 you state:

"(T)he building and the records kept within it were destroyed and the remains of all the WTC buildings were disposed of before congressional action and funding was available for this Investigation to begin. As a result, there are some facts that could not be discerned, and thus there are uncertainties in this accounting. Nonetheless, NIST was able to gather sufficient evidence and documentation to conduct a full investigation upon which to reach firm findings and conclusions. (Report, p. 13)

However, you fail to mention that without the columns, beams, floor pans, and other structural materials from the building, the conclusion that there was widespread fire in WTC 7, especially when photos indicate the exact opposite, is highly speculative and strongly against the laws of probability, especially when the central interior of the building where the columns and elevators are located would likely contain much less flammable material than the more peripheral areas where most of the offices and their contents such as paper were. Further, the structural materials could have proven, with a high degree of probability, how hot the columns got, whether there was actually any buckling of column #79 as the report claims, whether explosives were used, and whether there was evidence that the columns were cleanly cut as would occur with explosives. Finally, the rapid and illegal destruction of the evidence should have been remarked upon

in your report, as well as the fact that such conduct or spoliation may be considered as evidence of a coverup and/or complicity by the government.

In addition, the NIST report has numerous other significant shortcomings, including, but not limited to the following based upon a necessarily partial review of your report given the exceedingly short period allowed for comment:

1. The report's conclusion that there were large, long-lasting fires on several floors of the building is contrary to the photographic evidence, and is based upon very slim and questionable evidence. (NIST NCSTAR ("NN") 1A, pp. 16-17; and NN 1-9, Chapter 5). The report uses the words "would have", "could have" and similar language over and over, indicating that its conclusion about the spread of fires is not based upon facts or tests, but is based almost entirely upon speculation. On pages 18 and 19 the report describes fires moving from place to place, and dying down, e.g.: (13<sup>th</sup> floor) "at 4:38 p.m., the fires to the east had died down to the point where they could no longer be observed". (NN 1A, p. 19)
2. The report fails to mention that some (if not most) of the fires could have been caused by explosives or incendiaries. A video of the South Tower taken minutes before its collapse shows flames at the 81<sup>st</sup> floor of a white and bright yellow color indicating a much higher temperature than would be achieved by the burning of carbon-based office materials, which burn in a generally red-orange color. The video also shows white smoke rising from these flames. These facts strongly suggest the use of thermite and/or thermate as an incendiary which burns much hotter than carbon, and produces white or bright yellow flames and a rising white smoke in the form of aluminum oxide powder. This reasonable possibility or probability should have been considered and mentioned in your report.
3. The report fails to mention that the security firm for WTC 7, as for WTC 1 and 2, Securacom (later called Stratasec) had connections to George W. Bush, the Bush family, and neoconservatives, which may have made it possible for agents of our government to place explosives in the buildings and escape "detection" and reporting by security. This connection should have been thoroughly investigated.
4. The report's conclusion that the weakening of one column, #79, led to the global collapse of the building violates the laws of physics. Also, you acknowledge that the temperatures of most of the steel were not very hot. In fact, NIST's own tests of steel columns from the area of the fires in the twin towers showed that most columns did not reach above 482 degrees F, and

none reached above 1112 degrees F. Even when fires are hot enough to cause the collapse of a beam or column of a building, established fire science shows that the beam or column collapses slowly, and the collapse spreads only to other beams or columns that are equally hot. These known facts are totally at odds with the total, free fall collapse of building 7 in about 6.6 seconds, which requires all columns on a floor to collapse simultaneously, and on each floor in very rapid succession.. (NN 1A, 19-20)

5. The report's conclusion or summary fails to mention that the building came down in free fall time, a critical omission, and fails to mention that the only known cause of a free fall speed collapse of a tall steel building is controlled demolition using explosives and/or incendiaries. (NN 1A, 16-20)
6. The report fails to mention that four WTC dust samples independently collected shortly after 9/11 each contained many microscopic and tiny iron spherules that could be explained by the use of thermate, but not by much lower temperature fires such as NIST describes. Your report also fails to mention that laboratory and other tests of these dust samples show that the dust contained thousands of small pieces of unexploded thermite or thermate. (NN1A, 16-) Thermite and thermate are powerful explosives used by our military and which can be used for controlled demolition. (Cf. NIST's discussion of blast scenarios, which does not even mention thermite or thermate; NN 1A, 22-24)
7. The report ignores the evidence given by eyewitnesses that loud explosions in WTC 1, 2 and 7 occurred before any of the buildings collapsed and as they were coming down. In addition, the evidence indicates that some explosions in the towers occurred before either of the two towers was struck by a plane. (NN 1A, 22-24)
9. You fail to scientifically support your conclusion that 100 pounds of explosives would have been necessary to cut a single column of WTC 7, or that such explosives could not have been placed without detection. Therefore, you dismiss upon inadequate grounds the likely possibility that explosives were used to bring the buildings down. (NN 1A, 22-24)

The overall impression is that your report was carefully crafted to reach a foregone conclusion approved and dictated by the Bush administration, and to ignore and reject all facts and science that pointed toward a different conclusion. If this report is made final, it may eventually take its place as the most unscientific and fraudulent official report ever issued under the authority of the government of the United States. And if the collapse of building 7 was indeed caused by controlled demolition, with the approval of key officials

of the U.S. government, as I believe is highly probable, then those of you who have participated in and approved the report will stand guilty of the crime of obstruction of justice and of participating in a coverup of the worst crime ever committed on American soil.

Finally, your public announcement of August 26, 2008 established an unconscionably short period for comment before the NIST report becomes final, a mere 20 days. This short period is totally inadequate to allow the full and professional evaluation and analysis that your 10,000 page report requires on a subject of great importance to the American people, and to the science of building tall steel buildings safely and economically, especially considering that NIST took three full years to produce its report on WTC 7. This is to insist that you extend the comment period to a minimum of 90 days.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Earl H. Staelin  
Littleton, Colorado

(Comments also attached in rtf.)



Comments on NIST Draft Report on WTC 7 9-11-08.rtf